

From: Charlie Krohn
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 11/16/01 8:50pm
Subject: Proposed Settlement

Gentlepersons:

Although I disagree with the Court's findings that Microsoft violated any U.S. statutes or common law, I believe that the settlement agreed to by Microsoft should be approved.

I am at a loss to understand how the Justice Department can justify spending tens of millions of dollars to prosecute a case where the parties seeking protection from alleged monopolistic practices were competitors of the defendant. I thought the public policy behind anti-monopoly statutes was to protect the public. Just how was I harmed by receiving free software, especially software that was superior to that of the competition? Since when is the Justice Department's job to protect corporations whose products are inferior and non-competitive in a free market? Isn't Justice bothered by AOL's acquisition of Netscape? How is this different than Microsoft's situation? I don't know of any law that states that business is supposed to be easy or nice. Tough competition breeds better products at cheaper prices. Companies that can't compete should get out of the business. I don't see any justification for punishing the successful.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Hopefully the Department of Justice will find better uses for its budget than continuing its blind crusade against Microsoft.

Charles Krohn